43. Pattern recognition, Part 2

Recorded on 15th July, 2019 in Byron Bay, Australia.

Future Sense is a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name, broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. Hosted by Nyck Jeanes and well-known international futurist, Steve McDonald, Future Sense provides a fresh, deep analysis of global trends and emerging technologies. How can we identify the layers of growth personally, socially and globally? What are the signs missed; the truths being denied? Political science, history, politics, psychology, ancient civilisations, alien contact, the new psychedelic revolution, cryptocurrency and other disruptive and distributed technologies, and much more.

This is Future Sense.

Nyck: You are here on *Future Sense* with Steve McDonald and Nyck Jeanes, and unusually, we haven't received any texts from you guys today. Usually we get lots and lots of texts but that's OK. It's Mercury retrograde or something; maybe you just can't do the buttons and things.

Steve: Perhaps it's the cold weather; you've got to get those fingers warmed up first.

Nyck: Could be that. 0437 34111, however, if you want to text in. It comes up on the computer here and we can engage with your texts.

We're talking about pattern recognition in many ways and there's so much to talk about here, so we're skimming the surface and also going deep at the same time.

Steve: Indeed. As we do. Let's have a look at how we can use pattern recognition to help us make sense of what's going on. As I mentioned earlier on, we're moving now to a time where we are developing the capacity to see—detect directly—these different layers of consciousness, and understand that people are actually living in different realities, side by side in the same physical space, but essentially, as an analogy, running different computer programmes in the mind that shape the way that we look at the world, how we interpret the patterns of the world and work with them, and really shape our basic motivations in ways of organising.

Nyck: And of course they are, within themselves, coherent patterns for meaning-making for those people who are at that layer of consciousness to operate that way—that particular way that they are.

Steve: Absolutely—products of the amazing evolutionary process.

There are some really basic ways that we can come back to this binary concept to help us analyse where somebody is thinking from in terms of the complexity of their consciousness. One of the first things we can look for is this fundamental pendulum-like pattern which exists within the layers of consciousness; whether the themes, the central concept of the particular system, revolves around either an individual way of experiencing reality where it's all about 'me' looking out at the world and thinking about how I can change the world to suit myself, versus a community-based 'we' interpretation, which is all about thinking about how I can change myself in order to fit with what the world requires of me or to allow me to conform and fit in with the community around me.

You've got that basic pendulum swinging backwards and forwards and you can hear it quite simply in someone's language if you listen to how they talk about the world. Are they talking about changing the outside world and coming from a motivation of finding the best way for themselves—or the most powerful way as another example—or are they coming from a place of talking about how they are changing themself to fit with what the world is calling for or allowing them to conform to fit into community, with community, and those sorts of things? That's a very fundamental binary pattern that is the first step in understanding where somebody is coming from, and simply by understanding that pattern, you can start to shift and change your approach, how you communicate with that person, how you interact and work and collaborate with that person by understanding one of the most fundamental drivers, which is that 'I' or 'we' aspect.

Nyck: This kind of work is extraordinarily missing, generally speaking, from our understanding of the world, basically in organisations, certainly in politics, and even in families and local tribes—even those people who feel that they got it together, in some way are still possibly operating within a group of 10, 20, 50, 100 people who are operating in different layers as you're speaking of, so you can't actually meet another person somewhere where you are and expect them to meet that; you've got to somehow find a way to meet them where they are, to a degree.

Steve: That's right, and often we get distracted by the surface-level layers as we were saying before. It's kind of like looking at a tree and seeing the leaves of the tree rather than the birds that are in the middle of the tree. The surface-level patterns can be, for example, the topic of communication, so you might share a common topic of

communication, but you might be, at a deeper layer, approaching that topic from polar opposites—a self-centred approach or a community-centred approach, for example. And I'm not using 'self-centred' in any kind of derogatory way, it's simply a different perspective; it's working from an internal locus of control where you're looking out at the world and looking to change the world to fit you, as opposed to the community orientation where you have an external locus of control, where you're actually scanning the world around you like a radar scans and then using that information to adjust your own approach.

Nyck: Ye, and of course, it's not always either/or; it's likely that you who are out there listening, will be operating from both of those places to some degree at different times, perhaps.

Steve: That's right.

Nyck: But you may able to notice what the bias is; what is the dominant way that you are making sense of the world in the way we're talking about? It's useful to see that; to understand that.

Steve: That's right, and we are generalising here; we must generalise to explain this particular way of perceiving people in the world, but from an individually-oriented system, it's often about generating novelty—new things—and bringing change to the outside world, whereas the community approach, community-based systems, are often about creating conformity and bringing stability to the world. As we grow through these systems or as we have evolved as a species through these systems, we alternate between generating novelty and then creating conformity within the novelty, and then back to the other side of the pendulum, generating novelty again. Of course, if you think about the driver of change, when you're generating novelty, if that just goes on forever, it becomes confusing and disorganised—too many new things. We need this alternation, this natural binary rhythm, to allow us to consolidate the new things that we've created, the change that we've created, and then give us a foundation from which to step forward again into creating novelty once again, so it's very, very natural to have this I/we—and you can also call it masculine/feminine, your masculine being the 'I', feminine being the 'we' aspect. It creates an amazing evolutionary engine, in fact, that actually drives our evolutionary process, which takes us from stability where everything's cool and stable, and then new things emerge and the new things that emerge create a tension over time, which actually drives the movement up the evolutionary spiral.

Nyck: Isn't it exciting, folks, to think of it this way? It's very exciting.

Just going back, of course, to the beginning of the way we make meaning, I'm just referring here to a little piece on a term called "seriation", which is related to series, of course: "In psychologist Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development, the third stage is called the Concrete Operational Stage. It is during this stage that the abstract principle of thinking called 'seriation' is naturally developed in a child. Seriation is the ability to arrange items in a logical order along a quantitative dimension, such as length, weight, age and so forth. It is a general cognitive skill which is not fully mastered until after the nursery years. To seriate means to understand that objects can be ordered along a dimension, and to effectively do so the child needs to be able to answer the question, 'what comes next?'" (https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Pattern_recognition_(psychology)). Now, this is at the beginning stage of this, isn't it? It's a necessary stage for the foundation of all meaning-making in children, and it also refers, I guess, to early stages of human evolution as societies too.

Steve: It does, yes, and I think Piaget's referring there to the earliest operation of the rational mind. Before that emerges, even earlier in life, we can still put things in sequence, but we might be doing it simply from a process of pattern matching. We might have seen the sequence somewhere else and we go, 'oh, okay, it's like that', therefore we can arrange it just through pattern matching, but not necessarily through a logical deduction process, if it makes sense.

Nyck: That's right, but it becomes the foundation for what you're talking about—a more complex approach to thinking, to cognitive abilities as we grow up, and as we grow up as a species as well; and how we can actually make that balance between novelty and stability, if you will, and play with that figure, that pendulum swing.

Steve: Absolutely, and use that binary analysis to help us understand—and again, to use the computer analogy—what operating system another person or a group of people are operating from, and is it the same operating system that I'm operating from? If not, then how can I adjust the communication process so that we actually communicate more effectively?

Nyck: Yes.

Nyck: You are here with Steve and Nyck on *Future Sense* this morning on *BayFM*. There's been a little bit of an adjustment to the programming schedule here and you can check that out at www.BayFM.org where you can check out all the shows and you can replay the shows on demand from our website from each programme page. You

can see the songs that are played on each show, too, which are registered pretty much immediately, or very shortly after each show here on this station.

We're talking this morning about pattern recognition and the broad scale of what that actually means, especially how we evolved that ability and how it is expressed in different people, in different layers of evolution you could say.

Steve: Yes, and we're giving some simple binary patterns that can help you actually make a fairly sophisticated interpretation of which layer or system of consciousness someone is operating from by going through, really, just two or three simple analyses of basic binary patterns which are layered over each other or compounded.

The first one we just spoke about, which was the I/we difference: is somebody coming from a place of an internal locus of control when they want to make the world fit with their own requirements, or are they coming from an external locus of control where they're scanning the world and then trying to change themselves to conform or adapt? That's the first basic binary pattern, and often you can hear that in someone's language and the concepts they're using when they're talking.

The second basic binary pattern within the First Tier of consciousness is whether somebody is operating from a pre-rational place or a rational place, so whether the decision-making process is based on rational logic or whether they are operating from a pre-rational place, which means they're operating from basic urges and instincts and in-the-moment motivations.

Nyck: Which you could say is also an analogue for an individual growing up. That pre-rational stage through early childhood, middle childhood and into adolescence to a certain point before the rational starts; the prefrontal cortex starts to develop, which doesn't actually fully develop until mid 20s or so. You could say that's when the real full rational brain takes over.

Steve: Yes, that's right. In reality, these things are quite complex and so there are different facets to the personality and different facets of the personality will move through those developmental stages or layers at different times. We simplify it, and you might even say that we dumb the process down, just to make it more understandable. Understanding human nature is one of those topics where the more you dive into it, the more complex it becomes, but it's still useful to develop simple ways of analysis because they are useful, even though they can't be applied to every situation.

Nyck: In some ways, that's the beauty of reductionism. Maybe the only beauty—or not the only beauty, but the beauty of reducing something to that simplicity—is that you

can actually start to go deep from that simple model, and I think that's exactly the place where perhaps human culture on this planet generally is moving to.

Steve: Yes, absolutely. It's the foundation of all learning, really. If you look at the way we teach kids in school, they learn the basics first and then they build on the basics, and as we grow as individuals through these different layers of consciousness, every new layer of consciousness increases the scope of what we can comprehend and the amount of complexity that we can comprehend, so that also changes our learning processes and this is part of the reason why we see kids in school who learn at different rates, because some kids are operating from different layers of consciousness already at an early age. As we grow through to the higher layers of consciousness, we are able to immediately comprehend more complex patterns and patterns with larger scope—in other words, larger-scale patterns—and when we start to look at the more complex and sophisticated layers of human consciousness, we can see that we actually can learn very, very rapidly by looking for patterns within things rather than having to look at the individual pieces of the puzzle, for example.

Nyck: That piece I referred to before was about seriation in childhood—how the recognition of a series of things evolves—but in what you're just saying there, I'm seeing the evolution from that to the fractal, for example, at the scale that in this culture we are now aware of: the emergence of fractals, of chaos theory, which is related to that, too. That is a very clear example of how we're expanding our ability to perceive much more complexity within the systems, within nature, within our beingness, within, in fact, the very things we do. Traffic in a city, for example, is a very complex system now.

Steve: Yes, absolutely, and it's also why diversity in life experience and education is important, because learning about the way different things operate, you often subconsciously absorb patterns of operation or patterns of behaviour within certain things within a narrow field, which are transferable to completely different fields of knowledge. That's something I've certainly noticed in my own life, is that I've picked up patterns in one particular job in a particular industry, and then I'll go to something completely different and see that pattern in there as well, so you can apply it in a completely different way but it's the same pattern of understanding.

Let's have a quick look at the First Tier of consciousness. According to Graves's model, there are three layers of consciousness in two separate sections of the First Tier, so the First Tier can be broken down into a binary pattern, which is pre-rational operation and this rational-minded way of operating. The first three layers, which at a species level are Hunter-Gatherer, Traditional-Tribal and Martial-Warlike or Egocentric, all belong in the pre-rational zone, and that's a place when you're operating from basic urges and instincts; it's very much in the moment. I guess that one of the good things from an analysis point of view is that what you see is what you get, generally; there's no real

hidden strategy at those layers. Sure, there can be deception, but usually it's fairly simple deception, so you often can get a sense of a person very quickly because what they're expressing is basically raw stuff that's coming from the core of them—those basic urges, instincts, wants and needs in the moment. If you can figure out first of all, going back to the first binary pattern, the 'I' or the 'we' pattern, and then figure out, okay, is this person coming from a pre-rational place?, then in the moment you can analyse which layer or operating system they're coming from. You've also got to bear in mind with human nature that we are very changeable and so in different circumstances, different sets of life conditions, we may be operating pre-rationally or rationally, so just because somebody is coming across in the moment as pre-rational doesn't mean they're always that way, and I think everybody has encountered that experience somehow.

Nyck: You might be the CEO of a bank, for example, with a family at home, and perhaps you act very rationally as a CEO of the bank, but at home you may actually be the opposite of that—just flipping things on their head. Also, as you're speaking, I'm thinking about the martial level of that pre-rational phase. We're seeing, still on this planet, a lot of Martial activity, and how most of us, I think, who are, I'm assuming, operating from a more rational or beyond perspective, see the activities of war on this planet now as absolutely crazy; as just not rational to think about. The current situation with Trump and Iran, for example, is just one of many examples out there. We're seeing this militarism activated again, and for many people, it's like, why? What is that? How can we do that now? And I think it's quite obvious there's a big split in those who can really see the futility of things like war, for example.

Steve: Yes, exactly.

Let's just look at the pre-rational zone and then maybe we can take a break. Within the pre-rational zone, you've got three layers. You've got the Hunter-Gatherer, you've got basic Tribal, you've got Martial-Warlike. At an individual level, the Hunter-Gatherer equates to a newborn infant, the Tribal relates to young family life, and the Martial relates usually to those teenage years where things are getting a bit wild and you're discovering your personal power. So first of all, look for the I/we, and then secondly, if you've nailed it down to, 'ok, this person's coming from a pre-rational place, they're acting on basic urges and instincts in the moment', then the only further binary pattern you need to work out to discern which layer they're at is whether they're in an individual or communal layer. Within the pre-rational zone, you've got two individual layers and one community layer, so if you know it's 'we' and you know it's pre-rational, then immediately you know it's the second layer of consciousness, which is the Tribal or child-like way of behaving in terms of individual complexity.

If it is an 'I' system within the pre-rational zone, you then need to figure out whether it's basic Hunter-Gatherer or the more sophisticated Martial-Egocentric, and again, in

modern life, that's pretty damn easy because you don't run into many people operating from that Hunter-Gatherer state in modern life, so generally it's going to be Layer 3, which is that Egocentric layer.

At that layer, and in fact, within all three of these pre-rational systems, there's no real capacity to connect heart-to-heart with another individual. That might sound a bit paradoxical or weird to some people, but again, as you dive into this model, it becomes more complex. It doesn't mean that you can't connect closely with and be closely affiliated with other people when you're operating the pre-rational zone, but there is a limit to the depth of that and there's an extra depth that opens up when we shift into the next three systems, which is the rational zone.

Nyck: Yeah, you're tuned to *BayFM* here on *Future Sense* with Nyck and Steve, and we're talking about pattern recognition here today.

Steve: We are. We're looking at basic binary patterns and we're unpacking human nature on that basis, and finding a relatively simple way to start discerning between different layers of consciousness, and understanding, using the computer analogy, how different people might be running different operating systems than us, which are shaping them to look for different patterns in life and motivating them in different ways. So far we've talked through the basic binary pattern in human nature, which is the 'I' orientation or the 'we' orientation, which you could also call masculine-I and feminine-we. We then touched on a second binary pattern, which is the pre-rational versus rational approach; whether we're operating from pre-rational urges and instincts in the moment, just in a very raw way—doing, saying, being what we're urged to be— and whether we're operating, alternatively, from the rational mind where there is a logical choice process going on there. Kind of like if you were writing a computer code, it would be an if/then/else kind of a choice in a computer: if this choice then that's going to happen or else something else will happen if I do the other choice, right? And as we layer these binary patterns, we very, very quickly get enormous amounts of complexity and diversity so it's very interesting just to consider that these basic binary patterns will produce this.

We're going to look now at the rational zone in the First Tier of consciousness. Again, we have three different layers in the rational zone, which are the Authoritarian, traditional Agricultural era—everything's very linear and everything's about black-and-white choices and ways of being human. Then we have the fifth layer of consciousness, which is the Modern Scientific-Industrial, where we bust out from that basic yes-and-no choice in Layer 4, to a multiplicity—a whole multitude of those choices where we have different options and we look for the best and we're motivated to be the best in life. That is the dominant global paradigm at the moment. The third layer in the rational zone of the First Tier of consciousness is the Relativistic, which is the emerging paradigm for most

people on the planet at the moment, which is moving beyond the Modern Scientific-Industrial into this very humanistic, human-centred way of interpreting reality and very networked in its organisation.

Nyck: And very, very expressed here in this region, in the northern region of New South Wales, probably as much as almost anywhere in the world. It's a sort of vanguard—we can see ourselves, perhaps, as at the pointy end of this change.

Steve: Definitely a little bubble of the future.

Nyck: A little bubble of the future.

Steve: In this huge volcanic caldera that we call Byron Shire.

So there you've got three layers or systems in that rational zone, and two of them are 'we' systems and one is an 'I' system. Again, if you can start by working out the I/we orientation, then look for 'is this a rational-minded process of operating or is it a pre-rational process?' If it's rational, then we're in this second half of the First Tier, and if you already know it's an 'I' system, then straight away you know it's the Modern Scientific-Industrial mind and that particular worldview in operation. If it's a we system but it's rational-minded, then there's one more level of discernment to take place, so we've got to discern between whether it's a Layer 4 mindset, which is very old school authoritarian; a result of agricultural living—and I guess one of the key indicators is that it tends to be very, very linear in its thinking, so it's all about there being two choices in life—and I'm talking about two moral choices here—and there is a path to follow, which is the righteous path. A person at this layer, based on their particular moral stance, will pick one of those two choices as being the righteous path, so arguments tend to be quite linear and also very rigid and that the person has a very clear stance. In many cases, that's a good thing; certainly traditionally in society that was regarded as a good thing where this was the dominant paradigm.

Nyck: It's where the strong leaders, in a sense, come from, and as you're speaking, I'm thinking of our current prime minister, Mr Morrison, because part of the parameters of Layer 4 is the great religions, particularly the Abrahamic religious, but all religions, really—the structures of religions that lay down a set of rules that you are supposed to follow and if you don't, you're evil, if you do, you're good. That sort of simple polarity and dichotomy exists very much in our prime minister who was recently speaking at the Hillsong Church and praying for Australia and believing in miracles because he won the election; it's all very, very prescribed in a very narrow viewpoint, and arguably, the current Coalition [Centre Right] government is probably very much aligned to that sort

of way of thinking, along with Layer 5, which we talk about, too. But you certainly wouldn't say Scott Morrison was living in the Relativistic world of the Green layer, Layer 6, that's for sure.

Steve: Yes, we don't see that aspect in his behaviour or his thinking. It's generally Layer 4 or Layer 5, and as a very, very general rule, when we're talking about this way of understanding human nature, we say that people are often spread across about three of these layers or systems at one time. Usually there's one layer that's their dominant way of being, and then they'll still have one foot in the old world, whatever the previous layer was, and often they'll be also, at the same time, starting to push into what's next, so spread across roughly about three systems.

And there's one other interesting binary aspect which comes into play in this rational system, and that is what's known as the "shadow aspects of personality". If you can imagine that the pre-rational zone which we grow through is then superseded by this rational way of being human, both being within the First Tier in Clare Graves's system, it's like the rational mind casts a shadow on the pre-rational in some way, and so some of those irrational things can still play out, and will start playing out in our personality, but we won't be, in a rationally-minded sense, conscious of them playing out. In the theory of psychology, they call that a 'shadow aspect' of personality, and that further complicates an analysis in this rational zone. Once we figure out, okay, what I seem to be reading here in this other person is, for example, a Layer 4 concept they're expressing, you've then got to ask yourself, 'is that a shadow aspect of their personality?', in which case they might actually be normally operating from Layer 5 rather than Layer 4; and interestingly, when we're talking about Layer 5, because Layer 5 is all about changing the outside world, and by the time we grow to that point we are operating from a fairly complex mindset, this is no simple-minded process we're talking about here. Remember that it was Layer 5 thinking that took us to the Moon and back.

Nyck: Well, I was going to say that it's mirrored and reflected in our technology, this complexity of Layer 5. In fact, it's how it's evolved and it's also reflecting back. It's a looping system which perpetuates more and more complexity as we go forward, but still within that frame of 'well, what can I do to for me to get what I want in the way that I need to get it?'

Steve: Yes, so in Layer 5, we can actually see these shadow aspects playing out in a more conscious way because it is an 'I' system—it's about changing the outside world to suit me—and that can be changing other people and other people's behaviour to suit me as well. So we get a kind of shadow control aspect which is partially conscious—people are making conscious choices about 'ok, I really need to control these people if I'm going to get what I want and therefore I'm going to deceive them through some engineered strategy of deception.'

Nyck: Well, we mentioned fake news before—the whole fake news thing and the Trump administration, and beyond that, worldwide. I don't even know where that term emerged from, but I can imagine that Trump and Co. and this cohort of thinkers in their particular frame just sort of hooked onto it real quick and thought 'here's a real great way we can control people'.

Steve: Absolutely.

Nyck: 'Anything we don't like, we'll just call it fake.'

Steve: Yes, absolutely, and what's really interesting when we start to look at those control mechanisms, is that it's not limited to Layer 5 using Layer 4 strategies or ideas to try and control others. When they see that people are motivated by ecological concerns, for example, then they can do what we've come to known as 'greenwashing', where from a Layer 5 mindset, even though Layer 5 doesn't really understand and can't really see the processes of Layer 6, because that's just the way it is—as we go through these things, you can't pre-empt anything that you haven't grown through yet—what we can see is the simple observation that, ok, here's a group of people that are motivated by anything that's ecologically friendly, therefore, let's wrap our product in a label which says all of the right things and it's the right colour and everything else and it's going to appeal to that particular mindset.

Nyck: Capture another consumer base.

Steve: Yes, exactly, and of course, we know that as 'greenwashing'.

Nyck: Very good. We've only got another 20 minutes left on the show, *Future Sense*. Thanks for a couple of your texts. There's one long one here about snow—I really like it; we'll come back to that near the end of the show—but this is a really brief one with regard to what we were talking about with the pre-rational layers and particularly Layer 3, which is, you could say, the Militaristic layer, someone has written in and said: "Hi guys, war must be the greatest money-maker there is, so it's a pattern the warmongers create", says Rod, and indeed that's the truth.

Steve: Yes, absolutely, I agree with that, being a war veteran. It's certainly what I saw; it was the deduction I made.

Nyck: You're tuned to *Future Sense* with Nyck Jeanes and Steve McDonald, and you're going to be hearing a lot more about the upcoming Radiothon. I'm going to pitch here: we're really asking this time for your support to keep this station going as a hub of the network that is emerging here in this region, to really create, in my opinion—I'm not going to muck around—create a new world. Let's do it!

Anyway, let's finish this conversation, because it's very much part of the equation—seeing what we're seeing; seeing how we're seeing, and how that can be used as we move into the future—and I guess that's what we're going to finish on in the last 10 minutes or so: exactly what this means for how we are evolving now.

Steve: Yes, I think this is arguably the biggest challenge at the moment for us, is learning how to see this shadow pattern in the behaviour of the Modern Scientific-Industrial mind and its drive to want to control and change the outside world to serve its own means, and how sometimes it can construct deceptive scenarios and make deceptive communications, looking to achieve unstated objectives and often putting forward false objectives to try and manipulate people into taking certain actions.

Nyck: Boy, there's not much openness in there and all those statements you've talked about it.

Steve: Yeah, I know. It's tricky. It's an I-oriented system, so the central reference is 'me' in this system. It's not focused on the impact of my actions on other people so much as it's focused on my success in achieving what I want, and often, particularly for Layer 5, this Modern Scientific-Industrial mindset, that's in the material world. As we know, it also tends to minimalise anything that's not physical or material, and that includes the emotional life. So this is really our biggest challenge, and through what starts out as a very basic binary assessment process of looking to see, ok, is this person driven by their internal motivations or are they driven by an external awareness of the people and the environment around them? That's the first basic assessment. Secondly, are they operating from a pre-rational place or rational place? And if it's a rational place and if it's an 'I' motivation, then it's clearly the Modern Scientific-Industrial mindset at work. The tricky part then is discerning whether there's a shadow aspect to play, and as I was saying previously, for Layer 5, that shadow aspect can be quite a conscious choice—a way of achieving my personal success by doing whatever is necessary.

We've spoken previously on the show about the evolution of morals. We know that morals are a tool of conformity that tend to arise within the communal or we-oriented systems, and then when we break out of the 'we' systems back to an 'I' system, often we discard or at least modify, or try to modify, that system of conformity so we can achieve what we want personally rather than having to go with the group. In Layer 5, and particularly as the pendulum is swinging—this pendulum that swings in this simple,

most basic binary system between 'I' and 'we' expressions of being human—as the pendulum swings, as it is right now, to the most extreme version of the I, where the motivation to move back in the other direction is actually the highest, we're seeing extreme cases of I-oriented behaviour.

Nyck: It's a last ditch attempt. It's kind of like a crazy circus out there, especially with our politics, as we all know, as they try desperately to hang on to the last threads of their power—let's hope. No, that is what's happening. I mean, the time is over for this layer; there is a new world emerging, let's be confident about that. I'm very confident about that. I know there's a lot of evidence to the contrary, but I guess what we're saying is 'how do you observe that evidence? How does that emerge? How is it expressed? Where's it coming from in somebody? Where's it coming from the collective? Where is it coming from your group that's activating, perhaps, for something or other? All these questions are worth asking in terms of finding a more conscious and evolved way of approaching the global issues that we face.

Steve: That's right. I want to point out one more binary system here, which I hope might be the straw that breaks the camel's back. We have this thing called a subject/object phenomena in human nature. When we are immersed in a layer of consciousness, a particular way of being human, we are subjectively experiencing it, and like a fish in a fish bowl, we can't see it from the outside. It's only when we move beyond that layer and we grow into the next layer that we can look back, like the fish that jumped out of the fishbowl, at where we've been and actually grasp it in its entirety and also use it as a tool and work with it in a complete sense. So from Layer 5, when Layer 5 constructs a deceptive scenario, usually it's not constructed in a Layer 5 way. It's constructed in a Layer 4 way, right? because a Layer 5 person is still immersed in that particular way of being human and can't actually pop out of it and look back at it and use it as a tool, and so that Layer 5 mindset uses Layer 4. So a constructed, deceptive scenario will usually look like a Layer 4 system—it's perhaps two choices, but only one right choice, so it becomes 'you must do this because it's the right thing to do', and that's often the catch cry of a Layer 5 deception: 'this is the right choice; the other choice will take you to hell, this one will take you to heaven (metaphorically), so therefore you must choose this.'

Nyck: I can't help it, I'm think of the current Coalition government and I'm thinking about Peter Dutton and the whole refugee and the boat scenario when you're talking.

Steve: Yes, absolutely, and also in the nature of Layer 4, it's usually a very linear argument. There are no options here; it's not a multiplistic argument like you would find it Layer 5. It's a Layer 4 argument; there is only one viable option here. Yes, there's a second choice, but it will take you to hell, so you better choose wisely.

Interestingly, because we've been growing through this era that is characterised and dominated by Layer 5, there are lots of representative systems out there that have this built into them. Think of, for example, the medical system, and how driven it is to make people choose only the right medical system—don't go off choosing these alternative medicines, for example.

And then, there are the systems within that, like the pharmaceutical system which has been designed by this layer and has run its course over time. It's turned into a self-serving system for the pharmaceutical companies, and so the system is designed to make money for the pharmaceutical companies, not actually to heal you. You can't get better, you have to stay on the pills and keep buying the pills day upon day upon month upon month so that the money keeps coming in.

Nyck: Yes. The sad thing is that so many people, still, do not see exactly what Steve is talking about, but people are opening because people are dissatisfied, people are overwhelmed, people aren't feeling safe; they're not feeling secure, they're not feeling particularly healthy, generally speaking, so the measurements, the KPIs (key performance indicators) for the system as it exists, they're not looking so good, really.

We're nearly at the end of the show, but I think you've got more to say there.

Steve: Yes, I think we've got time for me to just drop one little bomb here. I just want to plant a seed and ask people to have a think about the dominant climate change scenario that we're facing at the moment, which is a very linear, only-one-right-choice system that's being presented by the mainstream. There's the choice of 'stop global warming, change the actual climate' or 'go to hell and fry like an egg in a frying pan.' What I want to point out is that is essentially a Layer 4 construction of an argument— very, very simplistic, there's only one right choice, you don't have a choice, you must do this, and in fact to the point of 'don't even look at any science that says anything different; don't even report in the media anything that doesn't fit with the one right choice.' Therefore, from my personal point of view, there's more to be unpacked from what we know about the climate, because this is clearly a biased representation of it. What I encourage is for people to explore alternative science and at least stay open to it, because once we close ourselves down to those options, then we actually confine ourselves and limit ourselves to one course of action, and if we find out somewhere down the track, as we always do in science—we always find out that, okay, our previous understanding wasn't complete.

Nyck: It wasn't complex enough.

Steve: No, no, we had a model, we thought we understood, but over time, new information—novelty—has arisen, which allows us to add to and make that model more

complete so we have a more complete understanding. The only way that we are going to cope with climate change—and in my opinion, there's no doubt that the climate is changing and there's no doubt that it actually is changing in such a significant way that it does pose a threat to humanity at some level—we must stay open to expanding our understanding of how the climate works. To do that, we must take at least a Layer 5 approach, which is to stay open to the options and look at every possible option and keep assessing and adding to our body of knowledge.

Nyck: That's great. I'm reminded of a number of things there, again, as you speaking. I watched a beautiful *TED* talk with Rick Doblin, who you know began *MAPS* in 1986, and is having a great success right now with the *FDA* in getting MDMA on Schedule 3 for research for application to PTSD (https://maps.org).

Steve: And I must say that Rick Doblin is one of the most decent human beings I've ever met in my life. He is such an amazing man—he's a saint, he really is.

Nyck: If you look up Rick Doblin, you can see his latest *TED* talk on psychedelic healing (https://www.ted.com/talks/rick_doblin_the_future_of_psychedelic_assisted_psychotherapy?language=en). He said there a simple thing: "We have a choice at this time between catastrophe and consciousness."

Steve: Uh-oh, that sounds like a linear choice.

Nyck: Yes, but it does detail a bigger approach.

Steve: It does.

Nyck: There's catastrophe here and we have to do this linear thing; or as you explained, no, let's actually open our consciousness to receiving more and more information and look deeper into these issues.

Steve: That's right. I was just joking then; I know that Rick's aim is to open people's minds to other possibilities, which is really such an important thing at this time, and it doesn't matter what topic you're talking about, we need at this time to be aware of deceptive plans to try and make us think in a one-track way and discard other information that's coming to us. We need to stay open-minded.

The evolutionary answer to this challenge that we're facing is trusted networks. This is what is emerging with the new layer of consciousness and it's why we're being driven to a new layer of consciousness, because at this time, we need to develop our organisation into a place where we can access trusted networks and use that to make the most informed choices possible.

Nyck: Very good. In other words, you could say 'make your mind like freshly layered snow', and I say that because of that text we received earlier, which I think we'll finish on—it's appropriate. Our listener says: "Think of the brain as a hill covered in snow, and thoughts as sleds gliding down the hill. As one sled after another goes down the hill, a small number of main trails will appear in the snow, and every time a new sled goes down, it's drawn to the pre-existing trails like a magnet. These main trails represent the most well-travelled neural connections in your brain, many of them passing through the default mode network. In time, it becomes more and more difficult to glide down the hill on any other path or in a different direction. Now think of psychedelics", and we talk a lot about the new psychedelic revolution, and we just referred to it before with Rick Doblin, "... think of psychedelics as a way of temporarily flattening the snow. The deeply worn trails will disappear, allowing the sled to take new directions, explore new landscapes, and literally create new pathways. When the snow is freshest, the mind is most impressionable and the slightest nudge can powerfully alter its future course." Very good. Thank you.

Steve: Very nice.

Nyck: That's it for *Future Sense* for today, from Steve McDonald and myself, Nyck Jeanes. Be with us next week, here. Thank you for joining us. Great pleasure.

You've been listening to Future Sense, a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. Future Sense is available on iTunes and SoundCloud.

The future is here now, it's just not evenly distributed.